



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/516,470

01/28/2005

Chris McEvilly

Q85082

6747

23373 7590 05/12/2009  
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.  
SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

CHOKSHI, PINKAL R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2425

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/12/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/516,470	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MCEVILLY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> PINKAL CHOKSHI	<b>Art Unit</b> 2425	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 28, 32, 34-36, 39 and 40 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 51-53, 63, 65, 70-73, 76-78, 92, 106, 144 and 146 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1-15,17,18,20,21,23,28,32,34-36,39,40,51-53,63,65,70-73,76-78,92,106,144 and 146.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed 03/10/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant alleges that the limitation “a transmitter operable to transmit, in response to a first user input identifying content to be recorded, a request to a remote capture system to capture the content identified by said first user input” and “whereby the user device initiates server side capture of the content” are not taught by combination of references Russo/Hoshen. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the allegation. Instead of combination of references, Hoshen discloses both these limitations. Hoshen discloses (§0067, §0070, §0071) that when the request to record a program is initiated and transmitted from a STB 10 to a Management system 57 at the Central Unit, management system selects Storage STB 20 to record the requested program. **Examiner's “remote capture system” in the office action includes Central unit (55) and SSTB (20).** As it is well known in the art that the definition of the *system* could include a server at one location and a receiver at another location and it does not have to be at the same location. Also, it does not mention anywhere in the claim that the capture system captures the content using the same unit and/or at the same capture location. Furthermore, Hoshen discloses (§0061) that the SSTB 20 is capable of acting as an *Internet Server* that captures content based on the request received at the Central unit from the STB and Central Unit instructs Internet server to

Art Unit: 2425

capture the content as explained above. Also, it is well known in the art to have Internet Server located at the head-end/Central unit.

Examiner would like to suggest Applicant if following limitations, about GUI, from claim 1 are added to the independent claims 51, 70, and 106, then it will overcome the current rejection.

“capture system is operable to download data defining a graphical user interface based on the record of the content stored in the storage device of the user device;

said graphical user interface identifies content that has been captured by said capture system in response to a request received by said user device and content that has been captured automatically by said capture system based on a user profile for the user associated with the user device;

the graphical user interface is operable to communicate inputs from the user to the server side of the content delivery system, whereby a request from the user to retrieve and playout content stored in the storage device of the user device is provided to the server side of the content delivery system”

With regard to dependent claims, the respective rejections are maintained as Applicant has only argued that the combination of references does not cure the deficiencies of claim 51, nevertheless it is the Examiner's contention that combination of Russo and Hoshen does not contain any deficiencies. Claims were rejected based on

Art Unit: 2425

the reference as a whole and not just the particular paragraphs/lines sighted by the Examiner. See the rejection below.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 51-53, 63, 65, 70-73, 76-78, 92, 106, 144, and 146** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,619,247 to Russo (hereafter referenced as Russo) in view of US PG Pub 2002/0154892 to Hoshen (hereafter referenced as Hoshen).

Regarding **claim 51**, “a user device for use in a content delivery system” reads on a stored program pay-per view system that includes a device at a subscriber’s site and regional servers that provides pay-per view contents located at a cable provider’s site (abstract and col.3, lines 24-28) disclosed by Russo and represented in Fig. 1.

As to “the user device comprising: a first receiver operable to receive user input” Russo discloses (col.9, lines 33-34) that the infrared receiver receives input from user using remote control as represented in Fig. 2 (element 162).

As to “a transmitter operable to transmit, in response to a first user input identifying content to be recorded, a request to a remote capture system to

capture the content identified by said first user input” Russo discloses (col.3, lines 60-64) that the communication link in the STB communicates with the cable system ordering facilities. Russo further discloses (col.9, lines 59-65) that in order to store a program material in the STB for subsequent replay, user selects a program from the broader categories, where selected program, received from service provider, is automatically downloaded.

As to “a second receiver operable to receive captured and processed content data from said remote capture system” Russo discloses (col.6, lines 54-58) that the tuner in STB receives content data as represented in Fig. 2 (element 104).

As to “a storage device for storing the captured and processed content data received by said second receiver” Russo discloses (col.4, lines 10-13) that the selected program materials by viewer is stored in the program storage unit as represented in Fig. 1 (element 14).

As to “a playout unit operable to playout the contents stored on the storage device” Russo discloses (col.9, lines 28-32) that the controller communicates with storage device to playout the content data as represented in Fig. 2 (element 150).

Russo meets all the limitations of the claim except “a request is transmitted to a remote capture system to capture the content and whereby the user device initiates server side capture of the content, provides client side storage of the captured content, and initiates playout of the captured content

Art Unit: 2425

under server side control by receiving a remote transmission indicating permission to playout the content from the server side.” However, Hoshen discloses (§§0067, §§0070, §§0071) that when the request to record a program is initiated and transmitted from a STB 10 to a Management system 57 at the Central Unit, management system selects Storage STB 20 to record the requested program. Hoshen further discloses (§§0061) that the SSTB 20 is capable of acting as an *Internet Server* that captures content based on the request received at the Central unit from the STB and Central Unit instructs Internet server to capture the content as explained above. Hoshen also discloses (§§0021 and §§0067) that upon receiving a request to view a program from a STB, management system controls the playout of stored content in STB located in the same cluster. Hoshen further discloses (§§0088) that the management system controls all the STBs within the cluster and provides access to stored content of a STB based on the request received from a STB. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify Russo's system by using server to control the playout of content from STB as taught by Hoshen so the billing system at the server end can charge subscriber or view user's activity every time when user plays stored content or make a copy of the stored content.

Regarding **claim 52**, “a system wherein said capture system is operable to transmit said captured content data together with said tag data to said second



Art Unit: 2425

receiver of said user device and wherein said storage device is operable to store both the captured content data and the generated tag data” Hoshen discloses (¶0085) that the headend manages content data that includes title id, broadcast time information. In addition, same motivation is used as to reject claim 51.

Regarding **claim 53**, “a system wherein said playout unit is operable to control the playout of said stored content data in dependence upon on the tag data associated with the content data” Hoshen discloses (¶0085) that the STB plays programming content based on the message received that includes time. In addition, same motivation is used as to reject claim 51.

Regarding **claim 63**, “a user device operable to receive said captured and processed content data at a data rate which is less than a data rate required for real time playout of the content by said playout unit” Hoshen discloses (¶0174) that the subscriber can issue stop, pause, fast forward, and rewind commands after ordering programming content. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to use the control unit to control the program and plays the content at different rate as taught by Hoshen in order to provide an option to rewind/forward/pause the video based on user’s need.

Regarding **claim 65**, “a user device is operable to transmit a recorded content playout request to said capture system and wherein said capture system is operable to redirect the user to the storage device containing the requested content” Hoshen discloses (¶0066 and ¶0067) that the STB selects a program playout request to management system that locates a requested program stored in the STB and assigns it. In addition, same motivation is used as to reject claim 51.

Regarding **claim 70**, “a capture system for use in a content delivery system” reads on a stored program pay-per view system that includes a device at a subscriber’s site and regional servers that provides pay-per view contents located at a cable provider’s site (abstract and col.3, lines 24-28) disclosed by Russo and represented in Fig. 1.

As to “the capture system comprising: a receiver operable to receive a user request from a remote user device, identifying content to be captured” Russo discloses (col.9, lines 33-34) that the infrared receiver receives input from user using remote control as represented in Fig. 2 (element 162).

As to “a capture device operable to capture and process content data as it is broadcast from a content broadcaster in accordance with said user request” Russo discloses (col.3, lines 60-64) that the communication link in the STB communicates with the cable system ordering facilities. Russo further discloses (col.9, lines 59-65) that in order to store a program material in the STB for

Art Unit: 2425

subsequent replay, user selects a program from the broader categories, where selected program, received from service provider, is automatically downloaded.

As to “a transmitter operable to transmit captured and processed content data to said remote user device for storage therein” Russo discloses (col.9, lines 59-65) that in order to store a program material in the STB for subsequent replay, selected programs are received from service provider and is automatically downloaded to STB.

Russo meets all the limitations of the claim except “a request is transmitted to a remote capture system to capture the content and wherein, in response to a request from the remote user device for playout of the transmitted content data, the capture system is operable to make a determination as to whether the playout request should be granted, and responds to the request based on the result of the determination.” However, Hoshen discloses (¶¶0067, ¶¶0070, ¶¶0071) that when the request to record a program is initiated and transmitted from a STB 10 to a Management system 57 at the Central Unit, management system selects Storage STB 20 to record the requested program. Hoshen further discloses (¶¶0061) that the SSTB 20 is capable of acting as an *Internet Server* that captures content based on the request received at the Central unit from the STB and Central Unit instructs Internet server to capture the content as explained above. Hoshen also discloses (¶¶0021 and ¶¶0067) that upon receiving a request to view a program from a STB, management system controls the playout of stored content in STB located in the same cluster.

Art Unit: 2425

Hoshen further discloses (¶0088) that the management system controls all the STBs within the cluster and provides access to stored content of a STB based on the request received from a STB. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify Russo's system by using server to control the playout of content from STB as taught by Hoshen so the billing system at the server end can charge subscriber or view user's activity every time when user plays stored content or make a copy of the stored content.

Regarding **claim 71**, "a system wherein said capture system is operable to process said captured content data to determine tag data identifying the timing of content segments within the captured content" Hoshen discloses (¶0085) that the headend manages content data that includes title id, broadcast time information. In addition, same motivation is used as to reject claim 70.

Regarding **claim 72**, "a system wherein said capture system is operable to transmit said captured content data together with said tag data to said second receiver of said user device and wherein said storage device is operable to store both the captured content data and the generated tag data" Hoshen discloses (¶0085) that the headend manages content data that includes title id, broadcast time information and transmit this data to STB to store this content data with timing information. In addition, same motivation is used as to reject claim 70.

Regarding **claim 73**, “a system wherein said capture system includes a video server operable to capture video data as it is broadcast by said content broadcaster” Hoshen discloses (§0072) that the management system includes a central server where the connection to these channels can be performed via a DVB to receive the channel from head-end. In addition, same motivation is used as to reject claim 70.

Regarding **claim 76**, “a system wherein said capture system includes a database, wherein said receiver is operable to store received user requests for content recorded in said database and further comprising a scheduler operable to process the requests stored in said database together with program guide data identifying the timing at which content is to be broadcast by said content broadcaster, to control the capturing of content by said video server” Hoshen discloses (§0024 and §0164) that the management system receives the request to view the program content from the STB and based on this request, management system registers this request and transmits a list of programs available along with the programs recorded on the STBs. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Russo’s system by registering/storing user’s requests in server’s database as taught by Hoshen in order to keep tracks of user’s activity for billing and accounting purposes (§0164).

Regarding **claim 77**, “a system wherein said scheduler is operable to provide channel data identifying the channels to be recorded together with data identifying the start and end time for the recordings” Hoshen discloses (¶0085) that the management system manages database of the programming content data that includes channel number, name, program start/end time which is to be stored on the STB. In addition, same motivation is used as to reject claim 70.

Regarding **claim 78**, “a system wherein said capture system is operable to generate a contents schedule for each piece of content captured by the capture system, which contents schedule identifies a sequence of content portions of captured content to be played out by the playout unit of said user device” Hoshen discloses (¶0065 and ¶0077) that the management system distributes EPG of stored programs to subscribers. In addition, same motivation is used as to reject claim 70.

Regarding **claim 92**, “a system wherein said transmitter is operable to transmit the captured and processed content data to said user device at a data rate which is less than a data rate required for real time playout of the content by said playout unit” Hoshen discloses (¶0174) that the subscriber can issue stop, pause, fast forward, and rewind commands after ordering programming content. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the

Art Unit: 2425

time of the invention to use the control unit to control the program and plays the content at different rate as taught by Hoshen in order to provide an option to rewind/forward/pause the video based on user's need.

Regarding **claim 106**, "a content delivery method comprising: transmitting from a user device in response to a user input, a request to a remote capture system to capture content identified by the user input" reads on a stored program pay-per view system that includes a device at a subscriber's site and regional servers that provides pay-per view contents located at a cable provider's site (abstract and col.3, lines 24-28) disclosed by Russo and represented in Fig. 1.

As to "receiving the user request at the remote capture system and capturing and processing the identified content when it is broadcast from a content broadcaster" Russo discloses (col.9, lines 33-34) that the infrared receiver receives input from user using remote control as represented in Fig. 2 (element 162). Russo discloses (col.3, lines 60-64) that the communication link in the STB communicates with the cable system ordering facilities. Russo further discloses (col.9, lines 59-65) that in order to store a program material in the STB for subsequent replay, user selects a program from the broader categories, where selected program, received from service provider, is automatically downloaded.

As to “transmitting the captured and processed content data to said user device” Russo discloses (col.6, lines 54-58) that the tuner in STB receives content data as represented in Fig. 2 (element 104).

As to “storing the content data received by said user device in a storage device of the user device” Russo discloses (col.4, lines 10-13) that the selected program materials by viewer is stored in the program storage unit as represented in Fig. 1 (element 14).

Russo meets all the limitations of the claim except “a request is transmitted to a remote capture system to capture the content and retrieving, in response to a user input, provided from the user device to the remote capture system, and identifying stored content to be played out, the content identified by said user input from said storage device and playing out under control of the remote capture system the retrieved content to an associated user.” However, Hoshen discloses (¶0067, ¶0070, ¶0071) that when the request to record a program is initiated and transmitted from a STB 10 to a Management system 57 at the Central Unit, management system selects Storage STB 20 to record the requested program. Hoshen further discloses (¶0061) that the SSTB 20 is capable of acting as an *Internet Server* that captures content based on the request received at the Central unit from the STB and Central Unit instructs Internet server to capture the content as explained above. Hoshen also discloses (¶0021 and ¶0067) that upon receiving a request to view a program from a STB, management system controls the payout of stored content in STB



Art Unit: 2425

located in the same cluster. Hoshen further discloses (¶0088) that the management system controls all the STBs within the cluster and provides access to stored content of a STB based on the request received from a STB.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify Russo's system by using server to control the playout of content from STB as taught by Hoshen so the billing system at the server end can charge subscriber or view user's activity every time when user plays stored content or make a copy of the stored content.

Regarding **claims 144 and 146**, "a computer readable medium storing computer executable instructions for causing a programmable computer device to become configured as the user device of claim 51/70." However, the Examiner takes official notice that it was well known in the art at the time of the invention to store computer program on computer readable medium. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to store computer readable program on recorded medium to Russo and Hoshen's systems would have yielded predictable result of easily installing program on the other computer devices.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. **Claims 1-15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 28, 32, 34-36, 39 and 40** are allowed. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The

Art Unit: 2425

present invention comprises a user device at the client's side and a capture system located remote at the server side wherein the user device transmits a request to record the content data on its storage unit to the capture system wherein the capture system transmit user's requested content data to a user device in which the playout of the content data stored in the user's storage device is enabled under control of the server side of the content delivery system. Furthermore, capture system creates a GUI defining the record of the content stored in the storage device of the user device.

The closest prior art, Russo, Hoshen, and Marko show a similar system. However, Russo discloses a stored program pay-per-view system that plays content stored on the receiver, Hoshen discloses content on demand stored on STB with the control of playout of this content is at the server side, and Marko discloses a receiver unit that is configured to obtain authorization from a remote distribution center to decrypt locally stored content segments. Thus, Russo, Hoshen, and Marko do not disclose nor suggest that the capture system located at the server side creates a GUI defining the record of the content stored in the storage device of the user device; graphical user interface identifies content that has been captured by said capture system in response to a request received by said user device and content that has been captured automatically by said capture system based on a user profile for the user associated with the user device; the graphical user interface is operable to communicate inputs from the user to the server side of the content delivery system, whereby a request from the user to retrieve and playout content stored in the storage device of the user device is provided to the server side of the content delivery system, as required by claim 1.

***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PINKAL CHOKSHI whose telephone number is (571) 270-3317. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8 - 5 pm (Alt. Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Pendleton can be reached on 571-272-7527. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2425

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Pinkal Chokshi/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2425

/Brian T. Pendleton/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2425